

REMARKS

Entry of this Preliminary Amendment before continued examination of the instant application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Preliminary Amendment, claims 8-14 and 23-44 remain in the application. Claims 1-7 and 15-22 are canceled herein. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5-7 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,087,051) in view of Yacobucci, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,858) and Thompson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,856). Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot based on the cancellation of claims 1 and 5-7.

Claims 2-4 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji in view of Yacobucci '858 and Thompson, and further in view of Kurabayashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,985,975). Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot based on the cancellation of claims 2-4.

Claims 1, 5-8, 12-16 and 20-22 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji in view of Yacobucci '858 and Thompson. Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot with regard to claims 1, 5-7, 15-16 and 20-22 based on the cancellation of these claims.

Regarding independent claim 8, the Examiner stated that Thompson discloses a two-part system, where polyisocyanate and polyol are stored in separate reservoirs in order to prevent premature reaction between the two components. The Examiner further stated that Thompson discloses **either** utilizing chemical blocking agents **or** storing polyol and polyisocyanate in separate reservoirs to prevent the premature reaction between the polyisocyanate and the polyol. The Examiner concludes that upon using the second embodiment, the removal of protecting agents is not required.

In response thereto, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has included teachings into the Thompson reference that are not taught by the Patentee. Thompson

discloses using a blocking agent or an encapsulating agent as a protecting agent to prevent premature reaction between the polyol and the polyisocyanate. This blocking agent or encapsulating agent is used in **any** embodiment set forth in Thompson, i.e., whether the polyol and the polyisocyanate is contained with an ink in one reservoir **or** the polyol and the polyisocyanate is contained in separate reservoirs. Removal of the blocking agent or encapsulating agent via heat or energy is required in order to initiate reaction between the two components, thereby forming an overcoat for a printed ink. This is clearly set forth in Thompson at column 4, lines 19-27, which provides:

To prevent premature or undesired reaction, the nucleophilic and/or electrophilic functional groups are protected either by chemical blocking with **blocking agents** or by physical barrier such as **encapsulating agents**. **With such protection**, the second reactive species may be present with the first in the ink itself, **or** it may be printed onto the same area as the first reactive species from a separate ink reservoir. **The protecting agents may be removed after printing by the application of energy or heat.** (Emphasis added).

As can be seen from the above quote, Thompson contemplated the use of a separate ink reservoir, yet still did **not** (contrary to the interpretation of the Examiner) teach or suggest the omission of protecting agents such as blocking agents or encapsulating agents.

Applicants' claim 8 has been amended to provide a method of **making** a fixative for printing on a print media, where the method **consists essentially of** at least one first reactive component comprising at least one iso-cyanate monomer or oligomer, and at least one second reactive component comprising at least one polyol, plus at least one base catalyst. The method further includes depositing the first and second reactive components on the print media and allowing them to react. Based on this amendment, amended claim 8 does not include a chemical blocking agent or encapsulating agent, and thus, removal of the same is not contemplated.

For the reasons provided above, it is submitted that the invention as defined in claim 8, and the claims depending ultimately therefrom, is not anticipated, taught, or

rendered obvious in view of the cited references, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 2-4, 9-11 and 17-19 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji in view of Yacobucci '858 and Thompson, and further in view of Kurabayashi. Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 2-4 and 17-19. Applicants further submit, for the reasons provided above, that the invention as defined in claims 9-11 (which depend ultimately from claim 8) is not taught, anticipated, or rendered obvious in view of the cited references, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 1 and 5-7 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacobucci '858 in view of Yacobucci, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,268,101). Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 5-7.

Claims 2-4 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacobucci '858 in view of Yacobucci '101, and further in view of Kurabayashi. Again, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 2-4.

Claims 1, 5-8, 12-14, 16 and 20-22 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacobucci '858 in view of Yacobucci '101 and Thompson. Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot based on the cancellation of claims 1, 5-7, 16 and 20-22. Applicants further submit, for the reasons provided above, that the invention as defined in claim 8, as well as in the claims depending ultimately therefrom, is not taught, anticipated, or rendered obvious by the cited references, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 2-4, 9-11 and 17-19 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacobucci '858 in view of Yacobucci '101 and Thompson, and further in view of Kurabayashi. Applicants again submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot based on the cancellation of claims 2-4 and

rendered obvious in view of the cited references, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 23-44.

In summary, claims 8-14 and 23-44 remain in the application. It is submitted that, through this Preliminary Amendment, Applicants' invention as set forth in these claims is in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, she is cordially invited to contact Applicants' Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.



Julia Church Dierker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33368
(248) 649-9900, ext. 25
juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813
Dated: June 6, 2007
JCD/AMS/slc